

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are all the claims pending in the application. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification, drawings and claims 1-4. No new matter is added by these amendments.

To summarize the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, the abstract and the specification and rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant addresses each ground of objection and rejection as follows.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because figures 4 and 5 should be labeled “prior art”. In response, Applicant submits replacement Figures 4 and 5, which include the prior art designation. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the abstract because it fails to specify the function of the cable and for the use of the phrase “of a steering”. In response, Applicant has amended the abstract to indicate that the spiral cable is capable of transmitting electrical signals (see page 10, 2nd paragraph) and submits that further description is not required. Further, Applicant has amended the abstract to indicate that a steering column assembly is referred to and submits that the abstract is sufficiently clear and concise. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application 09/767,859

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please remove Figures 4 and 5 and replace with Replacement Figures 4 and 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Also, the Examiner objects to the specification for not using “clear, concise, and exact terms.” In response, Applicant has revised the specification as requested by the Examiner in order to provide clarity to the disclosure. In particular, Applicant has replaced the instances of “steering” with “steering column assembly”.

With respect to the Examiner’s statement regarding the reference to the prior art Japanese patents as having corresponding U.S. Patent documents, Applicant is uncertain what the Examiner is referring to. Applicant notes that paragraph 1 of page 2 and paragraph 2 of page 3 include reference to prior art Japanese patent documents. However, Applicant does not see any indication of reference to equivalent U.S. documents within these paragraphs. Applicant further submits that the reference to the Japanese patent documents is not improper and, thus, is not a valid basis for objecting to the specification. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

With respect to the Examiner’s request for specific reference to the spiral cable, Applicant notes that page 10 at paragraph 2 discloses connection of the spiral cable to elements such as the turn signal lever and wiper level unit at a first end of the cable and to an airbag or various switches on a second side. Applicant submits the meaning of the disclosure is readily apparent to one of skill in the art. Further, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusion that the spiral cable is a “critical element” of the claimed device and submits that this conclusion by the Examiner is not a valid basis for objecting to the specification. Rather, Applicant submits that the spiral cable is one element among a combination of elements defined by claims 1-4.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application 09/767,859

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of objection.

Finally, in response to the Examiner's statement that it is "nearly impossible to ascertain the interaction of the various components as stated in the present specification", Applicant notes that the Specification has been revised as requested and submits that the interaction of the components is readily apparent to one of skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, with respect to the Examiner's statement regarding the spiral cable, Applicant refers the Examiner to page 10 of the specification and submits that purpose of the spiral cable is readily apparent to one of skill in the art. Additionally, with respect to the Examiner's statement regarding the cancel mechanism, Applicant refers the Examiner to pages 9-10 of the specification. Moreover, Applicant disagrees that whether or not a turn signal switch (which is not claimed) is manually reset or reset upon the completion of a turn is relevant to whether the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and submits that the claims are sufficiently definite and the meaning readily apparent to one of skill in the art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application 09/767,859

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian K. Shelton
Registration No. 50,245

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 1, 2005